

Application Serial No. 10/552,119
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4454

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated March 17, 2009, the Examiner states that Claims 1-25 are pending and rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims and adds new Claim 26. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-9 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chan (US 2003/0209174). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan. Claims 13-17 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Nolting (US 5,960,026). Claims 2 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Alvi et al. (US 5,451,738). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Nolting and Alvi. Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses these rejections.

Applicant has amended, inter alia, independent Claims 1 and 20 to add thereto the dust separation feature between the first and second stages (of Claim 1) and the primary and secondary gasifiers (of Claim 20). As opposed to what is advanced in the Office Action, it is considered that Alvi et al. do not disclose this feature, as the scrubbers 24 and/or 26 of Alvi et al. are not provided between their primary and secondary plasma reactors 14 and 23 respectively, but rather downstream of the secondary plasma reactor 23. Furthermore, no removed dust is recycled to the primary reactor 13 as only the pre-heater 19 feeds into the primary reactor 13. Applicant also considers that the foregoing arguments similarly apply to Chan and Nolting. Claims 1 and 20 are thus believed to be allowable over the cited references.

Since independent Claims 1 and 20 are allowable over the prior art, Applicant asserts that all claims depending therefrom are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as for the features that they recite. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Application Serial No. 10/552,119
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4454

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

September 17, 2009

Date

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Eric D. Babych
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 57,542